

# **First National Stakeholder Forum Proceedings Summary Document**

Conference held June 3<sup>rd</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup>, 1999 in Columbia, MD  
Proceedings Summary prepared by the U.S. Department of Energy

## Table of Contents

<b>Background on This Forum .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Opening Remarks</b>	
<i>Mary Anne Sullivan, DOE General Counsel .....</i>	<i>6</i>
DOE Commitment .....	6
Effect of Recent Events .....	6
Questions .....	6
<b>Overview of PEIS Settlement Agreement</b>	
<i>Jim Werner, DOE and David Adelman, Natural Resource Defense Council .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<b>Major Activities Completed to Date and General Overview of Central Internet Database</b>	
<i>Mathew Zenkovich, DOE .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>Panel Discussion from DOE, Plaintiff, and Stakeholder Representatives .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Jim Werner, DOE .....	10
Brian Costner, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research .....	10
Chris Hanson, Ross and Associates .....	10
Questions from Participants .....	11
<b>Data Presentations and Open Forum .....</b>	<b>16</b>
Overview of EM Corporate Database	
<i>Stephen Warren, DOE .....</i>	<i>16</i>
Questions from Participants .....	16
Low-Level Waste and Mixed Low-Level Waste	
<i>Douglas Tonkay, DOE .....</i>	<i>17</i>
Questions from Participants .....	17
Contaminated Media	
<i>Marilyn Tolbert-Smith, DOE .....</i>	<i>18</i>
Questions from Participants .....	18
Transuranic Waste	
<i>Marilyn Tolbert-Smith, DOE .....</i>	<i>18</i>
Questions from Participants .....	19

High-Level Waste	
<i>Ken Picha, DOE</i> .....	20
Questions from Participants .....	20
Spent Nuclear Fuel	
<i>William L. Hurt</i> .....	21
Questions from Participants .....	21
Facilities	
<i>Ken Baker and Andy Duran</i> .....	22
Questions from Participants .....	22
Additional Questions from Participants .....	23
<b>Discussion Breakout Groups of User Interface Issues</b> .....	<b>25</b>
Group 1 Discussion .....	26
Group 2 Discussion .....	28
Group 3 Discussion .....	30
Group 4 Discussion .....	33
<b>Next Steps</b>	
<i>Jim Werner, DOE</i> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix A: DOE First National Stakeholder Forum List of Attendees</b> .....	<b>38</b>

**First PEIS Settlement Agreement National Stakeholder Forum**  
**June 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>**  
**Columbia, MD**

**Background on This Forum**

In June 1989, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. (NRDC) and other organizations (Plaintiffs) filed suit against the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Secretary James Watkins over the Department's failure to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) regarding its environmental management and weapons modernization activities. In October 1990, a settlement was reached which called for the development of two PEIS's, one covering the nuclear weapons complex's future configuration and one for the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (ER/WM) Program.

In 1995, DOE modified the scope of the ER/WM PEIS to exclude environmental restoration activities. In 1997, the NRDC, acting on behalf of itself and 38 non-governmental groups, filed suit against DOE and several DOE officials, alleging that DOE violated the 1990 consent order by failing to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the Department's environmental restoration program, and that this constituted contempt of court. On December 12, 1998, DOE and the Plaintiffs settled through an official Settlement Agreement.

The Settlement Agreement reached by the Plaintiffs and DOE avoided further litigation by mandating that DOE take three major actions to enhance public understanding of the multi-billion dollar cleanup of DOE's nuclear weapons complex. The terms of the Settlement Agreement require DOE to accomplish three major tasks:

1. Develop and deploy an integrated database containing specific information on waste, facilities, and contaminated media for which DOE has responsibility;
2. Conduct a study on long-term stewardship for DOE sites; and
3. Establish a \$6.25 million fund for technical and scientific reviews.

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, DOE must sponsor at least two National Stakeholder Forums to address issues relating to the database (hereinafter referred to as the Central Internet Database or CID) stipulated in the Settlement Agreement. The purpose of this first stakeholder forum is for DOE representatives and Stakeholders to review the proposed outline, structure, and linkages of the database required by the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

In conjunction with the Forum, all background materials and forum presentations can be found on the World Wide Web at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/index2.html>.

## **Introduction**

Jim Werner opened the meeting, welcomed the participants, and reviewed the general purposes of the Forum. He also introduced the facilitators from the Meridian Institute. The facilitators briefly reviewed the agenda and some logistical matters about the way the next day and a half would work.

**Thursday, June 3, 1999, 8:30 AM**  
**Opening Remarks**  
**Mary Anne Sullivan, DOE General Counsel**

Mary Anne Sullivan, DOE General Counsel, opened the Forum by underscoring the importance of the PEIS Settlement to DOE. She recognized that the PEIS Settlement was the most unusual and creative settlement that DOE has been a party to, and believes it represents a “win-win” situation that will benefit both DOE and the Stakeholders. She said that she is going to insist first that DOE comply with the elements of the Court Order, both to ensure legal compliance with the Court and because the initial effort to construct the database with the data that the Settlement Agreement requires will be a substantial challenge. Once the database is up and operating, there will be an opportunity to evaluate further enhancements to the data and functionality of the Central Internet Database.

**DOE Commitment.** Ms. Sullivan noted that this Settlement Agreement reflects an Administration commitment to try to settle lawsuits in constructive ways. She also expressed her strong belief that the Central Internet Database, when available, will improve information flow and day-to-day working relationships between Stakeholders and DOE, and within DOE itself among different offices, leading to a better understanding of issues. She stated that the department-wide commitment to work together in this effort is already evident, noting that all programs, including the Offices of Environmental Management (EM), Science (SC), Nuclear Energy (NE), Field Integration (FI), Defense Programs (DP), and Environment, Safety, and Health (EH) have agreed to work together to implement the Central Internet Database. Although this should not be noteworthy, in fact, it is unusual compared to ways the Department has traditionally operated.

**Effect of Recent Events.** Ms. Sullivan also indicated that she does not believe that either the recent espionage incidents or the DOE reorganization will have an impact on the development of the Central Internet Database. Ms. Sullivan recognized the value of agreements that provide better data to all parties, particularly in inherently controversial areas such as environmental activities.

Ms. Sullivan also asked that when issues arise, Stakeholders first look to their specific DOE site to settle matters cooperatively, and then look to DOE Headquarters staff to see if an agreement can be reached before a lawsuit is filed. If Stakeholders are still not satisfied, they should feel free to call her personally so that she can attempt to broker a mutually acceptable outcome in lieu of filing a lawsuit.

**Questions.**

Following Ms. Sullivan’s initial comments, the floor was opened for questions and comments from Forum attendees:

Participant # 1. There was concern that in order to comply with the minimum requirements of

the PEIS Settlement the design of the initial system will be limited.

- Participant # 2. Another participant suggested that all comments are recorded for future consideration even if DOE may not be able to incorporate them into the initial database (i.e., because they are beyond meeting the strict requirements of the PEIS Settlement). Ms. Sullivan emphasized that only the database content will be initially limited to that data specifically called for in the Settlement Agreement, but the design (user-interface) of the system is open to stakeholder input and suggestions, and that the expansion of data content may also be evaluated after the core commitments are met. She agreed that all comments and suggestions from Stakeholders at the Forum will be recorded and considered for future releases of the database.
- Participant # 3. There was concern that the PEIS Settlement outlines a minimum of information to include and that DOE will adhere strictly to the language and thus will only provide a minimal amount of information. Ms. Sullivan again emphasized that DOE will focus on meeting the requirements of the database and that more data and functionality could be added to the system later.
- Participant # 4. A question was raised as to whether there was a legal commitment for DOE to represent accurate data (because, in the past, Stakeholders have found that available data are sometimes perceived as inaccurate). Ms. Sullivan responded by explaining that the data will be the best that DOE has since DOE plans on using this database as much as, if not more, than the Stakeholders.
- Participant # 5. There was a concern about the “Security” messages now appearing on DOE web sites (the messages that warn that any visitor can be investigated). Ms. Sullivan explained that this is typically the case with many web sites, but DOE states this possibility directly to any visitor to their web sites. However, DOE will only exercise this right if there seems to be a definite need (i.e., DOE will not be tapping user’s phones, etc.).

**Thursday, June 3, 1999, 9:00 AM**  
**Overview of PEIS Settlement Agreement**  
**Jim Werner, DOE and David Adelman, Natural Resource Defense Council (NRDC)**

Jim Werner, Director of DOE's Office of Strategic Planning in the Office of Environmental Management and the Point of Contact for development of the Central Internet Database, opened the first plenary session with a brief introduction. Mr. Werner described the history of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) Settlement Agreement and briefly outlined the three major components of the PEIS Settlement including the National Stewardship Study, the \$6.25 million Citizen Monitoring Fund, and the Central Internet Database. Mr. Werner emphasized that the initial information in the database will be limited to the information outlined in the Settlement Agreement and that attempts to add more will be made in the future if resources and opinion warrant it. (Mr. Werner's presentation, entitled "Overview of PEIS Settlement," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

During questions following the presentation, one participant asked what would happen if Congress does not approve the remaining \$5 million for the Fund (\$1.25 million has already been allocated to RESOLVE, Inc.). Mr. Werner indicated that the Settlement contains a provision that if the remaining money is not approved then DOE and the Plaintiffs could reinstate litigation. But, Mr. Werner also expressed confidence that DOE believes that Congress will approve the budget.

David Adelman of the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) (the lead Plaintiff organization in the lawsuit) then provided a summary of the Plaintiffs' point of view and motivations. According to Mr. Adelman, the Plaintiffs were hoping that the Settlement would make available information omitted from the original PEIS, enhance public knowledge of DOE, and make available to the public up-to-date information about DOE waste generation and management activities. Mr. Adelman emphasized that the long-term stewardship study (the other half of DOE's cleanup program) is also a critical issue in the eyes of the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs hope that the Central Internet Database will encompass information from all of DOE's major programs, allow flexible reports and queries, and include information on waste characterization, waste generators, and disposition.

Mr. Adelman also emphasized that the Plaintiffs hoped the database could be updated as often as possible (rather than once per year stipulated in the Settlement Agreement), be continued for more than 5 years, and contain details on contaminated media and waste generated at the site level. Regardless, the Plaintiffs hope that DOE will place substantial effort ensuring the reliability of the data.



**Thursday, June 3, 1999, 9:30 AM**  
**Major Activities Completed to Date and General Overview of Central Internet Database**  
**Mathew Zenkowich, DOE**

Mathew Zenkowich, from the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis and day-to-day project manager for the developing the Central Internet Database, summarized the major activities completed to date and provided a general overview of the proposed Central Internet Database. Mr. Zenkowich indicated DOE has developed a draft project plan, created of an interactive web site ([www.em.doe.gov/settlement](http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement)), conducted preliminary analyses of data sources, identified an initial linkages list (as required by Section II.G of the Settlement Agreement), and awarded a contract to a database development contractor. Mr. Zenkowich also indicated DOE has formed an active project team composed of representatives from DOE Offices of Science, Environmental Management, Defense Programs, Nuclear Energy, and Field Integration. DOE also worked with a group of Plaintiffs, the Plaintiff Working Team, which was instrumental in planning this first Stakeholder Forum.

Mr. Zenkowich talked briefly about the major source data systems that will provide the information that will be contained in the Central Internet Database:

- The EM Corporate Database,
- The Facility Information Management System,
- The National Spent Fuel Database,
- The Materials in Inventory Report, and
- *The Annual Report of Waste Generation and Pollution Prevention and the Toxic Release Inventory.*

Mr. Zenkowich pointed out some potential issues associated with the different data sources that the project team will need to address including update schedules that are not consistent; data from different databases that will need to be reconciled because conflicts in the data currently exist; some data sources that are not well populated; and some of the data will not be available until Fall 1999.

Mr. Zenkowich then introduced the proposed list of linkages to the Central Internet Database that DOE has prepared. There are three types of these prepared linkages: (1) data sources that will be integrated into the Central Internet Database, (2) links to other databases, and (3) links to reports and tables.

Finally, Mr. Zenkowich outlined the general tasks that need to be completed in order for the Central Internet Database deadlines to be met.

(Mr. Zenkowich's presentation, entitled "Status of Database Development," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

**Thursday, June 3, 1999, 10:00 AM**  
**Panel Discussion from DOE, Plaintiff, and Stakeholder Representatives**

**Jim Werner, DOE**

Jim Werner offered his views on the major issues and challenges associated with the creation and implementation of the Central Internet Database. The first major issue deals with the difficulties in using language and terminology that system developers and database users alike can understand, especially given the technical jargon commonly used in both the computer field and with waste management issues. Examples he cited include the overwhelming use of acronyms and the difficulties relating data to local issues. In addition, Mr. Werner discussed some of the technical issues he sees, including the challenges DOE faces in designing a database now that can still be a useful tool 6 ½ years from now, the minimum amount of time DOE will be responsible for operating the data system under the Agreement.

**Brian Costner, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (Plaintiff Representative)**

Brian Costner spoke about what he (and the Plaintiffs) see as the challenges and issues. Mr. Costner explained that he does not believe that the challenge is developing the database (the database is simple), but that it dates back 10 years to the original lawsuit, which was brought in an attempt to confront the modernization of the nuclear weapons complex and to get at bigger issues about our fundamental priorities as a nation. Those bigger issues have not changed. It is also important to understand that the database does not offer solutions the bigger issues; the database just helps the public to get closer to solving some of the resulting problems. He stressed the importance of doing the database well in order to get better information that will result in better decisions. By making data directly available to users and providing better access to the raw data collected by DOE, the database will be a tool to empower local communities, and a tool to help make better decisions. Finally, the goal is for all people, not just Stakeholders, to become informed citizens.

**Chris Hanson, Ross and Associates (Stakeholder Representative)**

Chris Hanson of Ross and Associates (Seattle, WA) provided a brief introduction of his past experiences involved with DOE data collection and management efforts that he gained by supporting the National Governor's Association and states on such initiatives as the Federal Facility Compliance Act and *Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure* (PtC). He indicated that DOE has consistently improved its data collection efforts since initial data on the Site Treatment Plans as part of the Federal Facility Compliance Act were gathered in 1993. He cited the 1998 Paths to Closure document as an example of how DOE data collection efforts have improved, providing more robust and consistent information about DOE waste management activities than in the past.

Mr. Hanson also addressed some systemic weaknesses in DOE's data collection efforts. He noted that the data presented in analyses and databases are only as good as the information

collected, and that much of DOE's data on environmental restoration and nuclear materials is still not very clear and only focuses on activities within the Office of Environmental Management. He discussed challenges that DOE will face in implementing this database, including tracking waste and cleanup from sites not within the Environmental Management program; whether the data will allow users to determine if DOE is keeping its promises for environmental actions; and whether it will allow DOE to be held accountable.

### Questions From Participants

- Dirk Dunning, State of Oregon, Office of Energy: *What will you do to provide credible and quality data in this database? We found certain data in the Hanford information system that we believe was deliberately falsified.*
  - Jim Werner of DOE responded by stating that Headquarters relies on the data provided to them by the Field in terms of what is submitted and the quality of that data. Mr. Werner said that DOE can provide information on the source systems of the data so that users of the Central Internet Database can see the origins and context of the data. In addition, Mr. Werner explained that the Central Internet Database will act as a "spotlight" on the data and, as a result, the data should be the best possible (if it is not, Stakeholders will be able to point out discrepancies).
- Gregory deBruler, Columbia River United: *Will all the source term data be included in the database (for past releases)? Will DOE commit to including "trust and tribal government" as part of the perspective in determining the "major chemical and radiological constituents of concern from a programmatic and regulatory perspective." This is central to include throughout all database documents.*
  - The response to Mr. DeBruler's question was deferred to the afternoon session when more detailed data discussions on each type of waste were held.
- Velma Shearer, Neighbors in Need: *Suggested including in the database information about what the four categories of radioactivity are (i.e., high-level waste, transuranic waste, low-level waste, and mixed low-level waste) and their effects on public health.*
  - Ms. Shearer's comment was noted and her point will be considered as part of the next steps in designing the database.
- Joe Jaffe, Plenty International: *There are two challenges for DOE: (1) It is essential to provide data in a way that is understandable to the lay-public, and (2) Data should be timely and credible. He presented a sample of the TMI monitoring group web site as an example of a system using real-time feedback.*
  - Mr. Jaffe's comments were noted and will be considered as appropriate during design of the database.

- Arjun Markhijani, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research: *The accuracy of data issue will not go away. DOE needs to ensure the accountability of its field offices and DOE Headquarters should not just be a delivery mechanism for data. DOE needs to develop guidelines to ensure technical merit of data. The technical content of the data in the Central Internet Database must be verifiable.*
  - Jim Werner of DOE explained that Headquarters does not just hand the Field Offices money; Congress determines who gets what. Therefore, DOE cannot just keep funneling money to the field to improve data collection efforts. Mr. Werner also reiterated his earlier statement that when data becomes public, it will help improve its quality.
  - Brian Costner of IEER reiterated that the lack of accountability for data quality is a systematic problem and that the creation of the Central Internet Database will help improve the data because Stakeholders will now be able to hold the sites accountable for data quality and consistency.
  - Chris Hansen of Ross and Associates ended the discussion by agreeing with Mr. Markhijani and Mr. Costner and added that he believes that DOE is making strides toward accountability and consistency, evidenced by the creation of the Baseline Disposition Maps.
- Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation: *DOE needs to provide Defense Program data on a programmatic and facility basis nationally. We were told these [data from DP activities broken out on a programmatic and facility basis] were not available. But we know that LLNL collects this data on a very detailed level. Will the database reflect recent DOE reorganizations and, therefore, change what is national-level data?*
  - Jim Werner of DOE explained that Defense Programs waste information will be collected and provided in the Central Internet Database. Mr. Werner explained that a “charge-back” program has been implemented where each program is responsible for their own waste (rather than “handing” the waste off to the Office of Environmental Management to deal with) and as a result, waste stream information will be collected by the different programs, such as Defense Programs.
- Mildred McClain, Citizens for Environmental Justice: *Will DOE provide funding and equipment to communities without access to computer technology? How will DOE address training for these communities?*
  - Jim Werner of DOE explained that this issue was addressed in the Settlement and that there will definitely be hard copy reports that are available and the ability to contact someone to perform customized search and queries. Mr. Werner used the

opportunity to ask the attendees to provide DOE with input about how to disseminate the information. Mr. Werner also explained that DOE is already providing computer hardware and software to underprivileged communities through other programs, but that DOE cannot commit to providing computers or educating communities about how to use them under this project.

- David Adelman of NRDC indicated that there are some non-DOE sponsored programs that may help to put computers and access in communities in need.
- Brian Costner of IEER responded by saying that there are plenty of organizations out there that can provide computer resources and that there is no reason to involve DOE in this. He said that he would talk off-line with interested parties to discuss leads that he knows of.
- Harry Rogers, Carolina Peace Resource Center: *Will DOE track wastes such as MOX fuel that enter into the commercial sector, including secondary waste streams generated as a result of MOX production use DOE fuel in commercial reactors? Will the reactors using MOX fuel be identified as DOE sites and will the fuel be tracked when it is transferred to “commercial” reactors.*
  - Jim Werner of DOE acknowledged that it was an excellent question but that it would have to be deferred because it was not explicitly covered in the Settlement and DOE would need to determine how to handle it.
- Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CAREs: *How will “facility,” “site,” and “contaminated media” be defined for the database? What are the triggers for reporting? How much detail will be provided for each waste type? Citizens need these kinds of specific data because: (1) cleanup work is done on specific level (building or plume); (2) many Stakeholders live/work near these sites and, therefore, they should be subject to detailed community review; (3) macro aggregations of data by DOE often don’t match; and (4) communities need “micro” level data to understand the details and the systems behind different macro-level reports.*
  - Jim Werner of DOE responded by indicating that DOE will be sure to define all key terms that allow users to understand the data contained within the Central Internet Database.
  - Marilyn Tolbert-Smith of DOE explained that there will be help menus and glossaries that can be accessed very easily as the user moves throughout the Central Internet Database.
  - Ms. Kelley’s comments were also recorded and will be referred to during the later design stages of the Central Internet Database.

- Diane D'Arrigo, NIRS: *The low-level radioactive database maintained in Idaho should be included in the Central Internet Database. Data from commercial dumps should also be included. However, the national low-level waste management program cannot objectively track this information. The program tends to present and skew the data using creative definitions in a way that de-emphasizes nuclear power plant sources and overemphasizing medical/research sources.*

*DOE needs to track when DOE moves waste through different commercial facilities and indicate in the database when changing definitions of waste types results in wastes moving to different categories.*

*DOE needs to consider how to take advantage of the availability of public document rooms to provide database access and consider using resources in those rooms to allow communities better access to information.*

- Ms. D'Arrigo's comment about the Idaho Low-Level Waste Database was recorded for future consideration. Chris Hansen of Ross and Associates explained that some tracking information (when waste change categories) does exist, but that would be important to emphasize and flag the changes.
- Tom Marshall, Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center: *Given past problems with data quality, DOE should improve its data quality or at least outline/disclose the range of error that might exist with the data it presents throughout the five year period.*

*Data on TRU provided in background materials is somewhat misleading. He will provide comments on the specific materials that he reviewed.*

- Chris Hansen of Ross and Associates believes that there is a need for a metadata system (i.e., data about the data) to ensure accuracy of the information placed in the Central Internet Database.
- Jim Werner of DOE explained that the background materials were circulated for comments by Stakeholders and that any additional comments that the Stakeholders would like to provide on the background materials will be graciously accepted at any point.
- Bob Schaeffer, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability: *Database development and management information should flow back and forth between users and DOE through feedback mechanisms, not just one direction. He recommends the database should allow: (1) users to query data managers on data quality; (2) users to flag data discrepancies for other users to see; and (3) DOE should then make every effort to correct the source systems where data are shown to be in error.*
- Mr. Schaeffer's comments were recorded for future consideration.

- Jay Coghlan, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety: *Will DOE appropriately represent shipping and receiving sites and associated volumes? How will these transfers be emphasized in the database?*
  - Jim Werner of DOE explained that the Analysis and Visualization System (AVS) (which was explained in detail in a poster session during the forum) is currently tracking this information.
  - Doug Tonkay of DOE explained that there is a system (AVS) that already identifies situations where there are discrepancies between shipping and receiving sites (e.g., Site W says it is shipping X amount to Site Y, but Site Y says it is only receiving Z amount from Site W) and that once discrepancies are identified, DOE tries to resolve them with the sites.
- Kathy Crandall, Physicians for Social Responsibility: *As a user, three things that would be important to see in the database are (1) current Site Treatment plans (documents prepared as part of the Federal Facility Compliance Act compliance) for wastes at a site; (2) An explanation of the legal standards and who has legal authority; and (3) Information available on studies on the health effects of each waste type.*
  - Ms. Crandall's questions and comments were recorded for future consideration.
- George Freund, Coalition 21: *What will be the roles of National Governors Association, state regulators and state oversight offices, and Site-Specific Advisory Boards be throughout the database project? The groups are not very well represented here today.*
  - Jim Werner of DOE explained that representatives from all these groups were invited (and a couple were in attendance) and that he believes that they will continue to play a role in the development and implementation of the Central Internet Database.
  - Chris Hansen of Ross and Associates explained that the National Governors Association has been involved in the data effort and will continue to be.

**First National Stakeholder Forum**  
**Thursday, June 3, 1999, 1:00pm**  
**Overview of EM Corporate Database**  
**Stephen Warren**

Stephen Warren from DOE's Office of Environmental Management (EM), provided an overview of the contents of the EM Corporate Database. Mr. Warren said that the Integrated Planning, Accountability, and Budgeting System (IPABS), as the EM corporate database is known, is designed to track data from all of EM's projects and that formal system development began in the spring of 1998. Mr. Warren explained the purpose of the IPABS is to support EM's core business processes and in so doing, replace current data collection processes that are duplicative, time consuming, or poorly coordinated. Mr. Warren outlined existing data repositories that will be the sources of data for the EM Corporate Database to include Integrated Data Management System (IDMS), Analysis and Visualization System (AVS), Needs Management System (NMS), Technology Management System (TMS), Progress Tracking System (PTS), and Management Analysis Reporting System (MARS).

Mr. Warren explained that the IDMS module, which DOE will use to collect life-cycle planning and Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 budget formulation data and FY1999 performance measure data, is the first phase of the IPABS Information System. It will serve as a web-based tool for data entry, viewing, and reporting to allow multi-user, multi-site access to information. Mr. Warren also described the next steps in the IPABS Information System development process to include: (1) evaluating lessons learned from developing IDMS; (2) transitioning waste planning data collection into IPABS Information System by next fall; (3) incorporating full execution module into the next phase of IPABS Information System in time to begin FY 2000 execution; (4) expand reporting capabilities; and (5) improve interfaces with other Headquarters and Field systems.

(Mr. Warren's presentation, entitled "Overview of Em Corporate Database," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

### **Questions From Participants**

- Bob Neill, New Mexico EEG: *The disparity in the quality of data seems to be partially caused by lack of guidance to the Field from Headquarters. What guidance are you developing to help Field offices provide complete and accurate data?*
  - Stephen Warren of DOE responded that DOE has prepared detailed guidance and also looks at data submissions to determine if the data "makes sense." Mr. Warren noted that a feedback loop needs to be included for users of data to report inconsistencies.
- Dirk Dunning, State of Oregon, Office of Energy: *It appears that DOE planning begins*



*and ends with informal decisions that, in turn, drive planning and these planning activities then drive the decisions. Is there a way for DOE to avoid this circular logic?*

- Stephen Warren of DOE responded that DOE is carefully reviewing its baselines to evaluate both cost bases and the assumptions behind them. Bill Wisenbaker of DOE noted that because DOE provides planning, projections, and estimates for out years, there will always be discrepancies between planned project data and the execution data for that year.

### **Low-Level Waste and Mixed Low-Level Waste Douglas Tonkay**

Douglas Tonkay, DOE Office of Planning and Analysis, Office of Environmental Management, summarized low-level waste (LLW) and mixed low-level waste (MLLW) data that DOE currently collects. Mr. Tonkay noted that data are collected on six levels that include: (1) department level, (2) programs level, (3) operations/field office level, (4) site levels, (5) project baseline summary levels, and (6) disposition map stream level. Mr. Tonkay noted the sources of LLW and MLLW data are the EM Corporate Database and IPABS. Other DOE programs (the Offices of Defense Programs, Science, and Nuclear Energy) are responsible for providing the balance of the waste data of their sites. Mr. Tonkay outlined the data from the EM Corporate Database that could supply the Central Internet Database.

(Mr. Tonkay's presentation, entitled "Low-Level Waste and Mixed Low-Level Waste," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

### **Questions From Participants**

- Ruth Murphy, Direct Outreach Impact Team: *Is information from Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI) and LANL Research Library planned to be included in the database?*
  - Doug Tonkay of DOE answered no, this information would not be included in the database, but a link could potentially be provided to these two resources from the Central Internet Database.
- Paige Leven, Heart of America NW: *Will the database allow users to identify waste coming from off-site as well as waste that is already on-site? Will data from sending and receiving site be consistent?*
  - Doug Tonkay of DOE acknowledged that there are some disconnects with the data and that DOE tries to determine what the correct data are through variance accounting.
- Greg deBruler, Columbia River United: *It's important to know the volumes of waste*

*coming into a site to evaluate the potential impacts. For example, the PEIS assumed disposal of mixed low-level waste (MLLW) at Hanford, but there are no plans that he is aware of to license a MLLW disposal facility at the site. If MLLW is sent to Hanford, citizens need to be able to analyze the cumulative impacts of all the waste the site.*

- This comment was recorded for future consideration, but DOE plans on providing data collected nationally on planned and actual waste transfers.

### **Contaminated Media Marilyn Tolbert-Smith**

Marilyn Tolbert-Smith, DOE Office of Environmental Restoration, summarized the contaminated media data that DOE currently collects. Ms. Tolbert-Smith defined contaminated media and explained DOE's restoration strategy for in-situ and ex-situ remedies. She also shared how variations in contaminated media data can result from changes in project scope, waste disposition plans, clean-up levels, agreements with Stakeholders, or improved characterization information.

(Ms. Tolbert-Smith's presentation, entitled "Contaminated Media," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

### **Questions From Participants**

- Marilyn Kelley, Tri-Valley CARES: *What is the definition of contaminated media? Does it include soils, groundwater, and sludges?*
  - Marilyn Tolbert-Smith of DOE answered that yes, the definition of contaminated media includes soils, groundwater, and buried waste.
- Greg deBruler, Columbia River United: *Some users will need to have source term information in the database. Without valid source streams he pointed out you cannot do a valid Project Baseline Summary.*
  - The comment was noted and DOE will provide the information it already collects nationally about waste sources and their characteristics as part of the Central Internet Database.

### **Transuranic Waste Marilyn Tolbert-Smith**

Marilyn Tolbert-Smith, DOE Office of Environmental Restoration, also summarized the transuranic (TRU) waste data that DOE currently collects. She indicated that prior to 1970 TRU waste did not exist by definition and that DOE established the waste category to distinguish it from low level waste. Ms. Tolbert-Smith identified the sources of TRU waste, as well as those

sites reporting it. Ms. Tolbert-Smith indicated that IPABS will be the source of TRU data for the Central Internet Database. Ms. Tolbert-Smith also noted that pre-1970 data on buried TRU waste is limited and inconclusive. She described recent efforts to collect data on buried TRU waste.

(Ms. Tolbert-Smith's presentation, entitled "Transuranic Waste," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

### Questions From Participants

- Arjun Makhijani, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research: *He indicated he was very pleased that DOE had undertaken a data collection program for buried TRU waste. He asked, what is the process of determining and verifying buried TRU data at a site? What is Headquarters' interaction with the Field offices to ensure the accuracy of these numbers? Because EM collects information about where the data comes from, he requested that this be included in the database.*
- Marilyn Tolbert-Smith of DOE responded that DOE has technical staff who review the data submitted. Bill Wisenbaker of DOE also responded that DOE is trying to get the Field to define and document their assumptions when coming up with their numbers for buried TRU.
- Eric Perry, Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping: *What level of detail will be included in the database? For example, will information be included on waste forms, what radionuclides are present, the dates when materials were generated and managed, and how materials were managed? Will it include whether any hazardous incidents occurred? What is controlled data? Will classified data be noted as "classified" when it is not included (or will it simply not be included)?*
- Jim Werner of DOE responded that some of this information will be included and some will not, but all comments were recorded and will be considered at the appropriate stage of the Central Internet Database development.
- Mike Veilvua, Western States Legal Foundation: *There is a "big D" data, which is really EM data, and then there's a "little d" data, which are the assumptions and unknowns that are present in projects such as environmental restoration. To be useful, DOE must distinguish these data in the database and provide the assumptions used in the "little d" data.*
- Bill Wisenbaker of DOE noted that, historically, as the data have changed for whatever reasons, DOE has just presented the new numbers without explaining what the difference in numbers is or why there is a difference. This is a weakness in data systems that DOE is currently working on improving.

## High-Level Waste Data

### Ken Picha

Ken Picha, DOE Office of Planning and Analysis, summarized high-level waste (HLW) data that DOE currently collects. Mr. Picha defined HLW and outlined its sources of generation from DOE activities. Mr. Picha indicated that data is collected on six levels that include: (1) department level, (2) programs level, (3) operations/field office level, (4) site levels, (5) project baseline summary levels, and (6) disposition map stream level. Mr. Picha noted the sources of HLW data are the EM Corporate Database and IPABS. Mr. Picha also detailed the data from the Corporate Database that could supply the Central Internet Database.

(Mr. Picha's presentation, entitled "High-Level Waste," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

### Questions From Participants

- Bob Neill, New Mexico EEG: *Is the exclusion of spent nuclear fuel from the HLW definition an inadvertent omission?*
  - Ken Picha of DOE responded that although 10 CFR 60 includes SNF in its definition of HLW, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and draft DOE Order 435.1 does not include SNF as part of the HLW definition.
- Dirk Dunning, State of Oregon, Office of Energy: *The changing of a few words in the HLW definition of proposed DOE Order 435.1 (from that currently used in DOE Order 5820.2A) may have substantial impact, and may on its own, require DOE to prepare an environmental impact statement. At a minimum, the waste no longer classified as HLW under the new definition should be called out separately in the database.*
  - Ken Picha of DOE replied that DOE's General Counsel has interpreted that the HLW definition in proposed DOE Order 435.1 is consistent with the Atomic Energy Act and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.
  - Mr. Dunning's question initiated a discussion with several other participants on the topic of the definition of HLW and other definitions in general. Participants were ensured that any time a definition changes, the database will include some type of system that will explain discrepancies between definitions. All comments related to this question were recorded for future consideration.
- Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation: *She has been operating under the assumption that SNF was HLW. If SNF is not HLW, then there needs to be a way for users to quickly access the SNF information. If waste classifications are changing, users may need a complete review of all waste classifications so they understand new definitions.*

- Ms. Cabasso's comment was recorded and will be considered in designing the Central Internet Database to ensure that a pointer is included in the HLW section to SNF in its own section.

### **Spent Nuclear Fuel William L. Hurt**

William Hurt, DOE Office of Spent Fuel Management, summarized spent nuclear fuel (SNF) data that DOE currently collects. Mr. Hurt detailed the scope of spent nuclear fuel tracked by DOE. Mr. Hurt also mentioned that the actual timing of SNF shipments is safeguarded. Mr. Hurt described the contents of SNF data to include quantitative figures, locations, characteristics, and a description of SNF. Mr. Hurt noted the existence of a classified database, the National Material Management and Safeguards System (NMMSS), a joint DOE/NRD database that covers all nuclear material except waste. Mr. Hurt related how SNF data are obtained, verified, and disseminated. In addition, Mr. Hurt described the interface of SNF data with other databases throughout the DOE complex.

(Mr. Hurt's presentation, entitled "Spent Nuclear Fuel," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

### **Questions From Participants**

- Harry Rogers, Carolina Peace Resource Center: *How will DOE track MOX fuel sent to commercial reactors? What if cladding breaches and the non-Plutonium 20 percent of the fuel becomes contaminated?*
  - William Hurt of DOE explained the circumstances when DOE will retain ownership of the fuel and when it will be commercially owned. Mr. Rogers comment will be considered for the record because DOE has not yet evaluated tracking MOX fuel in the database.
- Kathy Crandall, Physicians for Social Responsibility: *Will Naval SNF be included in this database? How will materials that have shared ownership (i.e. FUSRAP) be included in the database?*
  - Jim Werner of DOE responded that Settlement Agreement does not require the Central Internet Database to contain this information (i.e., Naval SNF), but that it would be included once the SNF becomes DOE property.
- Steve Hopkins, Snake River Alliance: *Will the database track fuel sent to INEEL for testing, including where it came from, how long it will stay, and when it is coming?*
  - William Hurt of DOE answered that DOE has information on where SNF is

coming from, volume, and contaminants. However, when SNF is arriving at sites and how long it will stay is not tracked.

- Dirk Dunning, State of Oregon, Office of Energy: *Will the database track nuclear materials and SNF materials from miscellaneous DOE research and testing programs?*
  - William Hurt of DOE responded that this information is currently captured in the SNF database and, therefore will be available in the Central Internet Database.
- Greg deBruler, Columbia River United: *Will some materials not currently or historically defined as SNF be included in the Central Internet Database and if so will they be identified separately?*
  - William Hurt of DOE answered that some spent nuclear materials are counted as orphan materials and DOE currently tracks them in the SNF database.

### **Facilities Ken Baker and Andy Duran**

Ken Baker and Andy Duran, DOE Office of Field Management, summarized facilities data that DOE currently collects. Mr. Baker and Mr. Duran described the purpose of the Facilities Information Management System (FIMS), as well as its benefits. Mr. Baker and Mr. Duran outlined the data that are contained in FIMS and the role of the Facilities Data Development Committee (FDDC). Finally, Mr. Baker and Mr. Duran provided several sample reports generated by FIMS.

### **Questions From Participants**

- Robin Kosseff, Bay Area Nuclear Waste Coalition: *On the sample FIMS report, how do you resolve the apparent discrepancy between “nuclides” fields and the “inventory” fields? Is 1997 the first year FIMS has data?*
  - Ken Baker of DOE explained what information was found in each of the fields. He also noted FIMS was started in 1995.
- Ruth Murphy, Direct Outreach Impact Team: *Is information about leased properties included in the FIMS database? For example, would contamination information about the East Tennessee Technology Park in Oak Ridge be included?*
  - Ken Baker of DOE answered that, yes, all properties owned by DOE are included in the FIMS database and that there are FIMS representatives at each site to input data.
- Greg deBruler, Columbia River United: *Who determines what radioisotopes are included*

*in the FIMS database?*

- Ken Baker of DOE responded that the FDDC, which is comprised of federal employees, determines what radioisotopes will be included.

### **Additional Questions From Participants**

- Steve Zappe, New Mexico Environmental Department: *What will the be greatest level of detail available in the database? Will it be “raw” data or “rolled-up” data? If data is detailed, will the level of detail be consistent across the different data categories?*
- Jim Werner of DOE replied that the Central Internet Database will provide as much data that are reported as possible, and that some data sources will be more detailed than others.
- Bob Neill, New Mexico EEG: *He noted that everyone has a different level of interest in the data. To be user friendly, you must provide different levels of reporting capabilities.*
- Mr. Neill’s comment was recorded and will be referred to during the appropriate design stage of the Central Internet Database.
- Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation: *Will I be able to access this database to determine what kind and how much waste is produced by DP? Will I be able to log on and specifically request Defense Programs (DP) data?*
- Mathew Zenkowich of DOE responded that DOE is working with DP who will be supplying data on their waste, and that users of the Central Internet Database will be able to find DP waste specifically.
- David Adelman, Natural Resources Defense Council: *The agreement has “hedged” language on what type of information will be included and when it will be updated. If data are updated more frequently at the sites, can the Central Internet Database be updated more frequently than once per year?*
- Stephen Warren of DOE replied that the EM Corporate Database will be updated twice per year and that a historical difficulty is saturating sites with data calls. He noted that DOE collected various data at different intervals including annually, quarterly, or monthly.
- Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CARES: *She would have been interested in hearing representatives from the Offices of Defense Programs, Science, and Nuclear Energy discuss their data. Is DOE open to criteria suggested by users through feedback on the database to review the request and determine whether the requested data are available.*

- Jim Werner of DOE replied that DOE is willing to accept user input and to try to implement as much as feasible.



**Friday, June 4, 1999, 8:30 AM**  
**Discussion Breakout Groups on User Interface Issues**

Day two of the forum began with several briefings to trigger the discussion about the Central Internet Database (CID) Internet application and specifics about how users will be able to access information and get reports from the database.

Mathew Zenkowich presented the first briefing, *Internet Overview*. He explained the basic concepts about the Internet including that it is a large network of linked computers that are widely used today to transfer information and is dramatically changing the way people do business and obtain information. After providing some additional information about how the Internet works, he noted that a common problem with the effective use of the Internet and the World Wide Web is the speed at which information can be transferred and that this would be an important element in designing the Central Internet Database. (Mr. Zenkowich's presentation, entitled "Internet Overview," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

Jim Werner presented the second briefing, *User Interface*. He presented a graphic showing how the Central Internet Database fits into the network of other DOE computer systems and databases and how users will be able to access information through the Central Internet Database. He primarily focused his discussion on the options available for designing the user interface with the Central Internet Database and how the user will be able to access information. Mr. Werner explained features that are available to orient the user quickly to what information exists on the web site and help the user easily navigate through the site. He asked the group to help answer two key questions in the breakout sessions: (1) How should the user interface look? and (2) How should the user interface work? (Mr. Werner's presentation, entitled "Look and Feel of User Interface," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

Pam Cole of Project Performance Corporation presented the third briefing, *Reporting Capabilities*. She explained that the goal is to design a system that is easy to use, easy to understand, and that can easily generate both detailed and summary reports in a variety of output formats. She explained the differences between pre-defined standard reports and user-designed custom reports. She also presented potential issues involved with enabling the user to extract raw data from the database. She also asked Forum attendees to focus on two key questions: (1) What information should be supplied in standard reports? and (2) What options will be most useful for query results?

Craig Cheney of Project Performance Corporation presented the fourth briefing, *Accessibility, Training, Documentation*. He explained that there are two ways that users will be able to access data from the Central Internet Database, through electronic and non-electronic access. For those users without Internet access, DOE will provide hard-copy summaries of data, although DOE has yet to determine the specific distribution method of this hard-copy information. The Central Internet Database will likely be accompanied by a variety of training and user support options. DOE will develop training programs or computer-based training and user support services based on user needs. In addition, DOE will document the structure and operations of the database and

web site and distribute them to users. (Mr. Cheney's presentation, entitled "Accessibility, Training, and Documentation," can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.)

After the four presentations, the group divided into four sections to provide input on how the user interface, reports, and access should be designed. While the group was waiting for the rooms to be reorganized, they were asked to vote on the name of the database from suggestions that were taken from the participants the previous day. The name has not yet been formalized.

Each group focused its discussions on questions that were brought up in the presentations and the series of questions that were outlined in the background materials for the Forum. The following are a summary of the discussions that took place in each of the four groups and a summary of each group's major points made to the plenary session when the groups reconvened.

## 2. GROUP 1 DISCUSSION

*Q. Which of the three options (reports, searches, and queries) are you most interested in and will you use the most often?*

Participants in Group 1 suggested that there are four types of ways to use the database: (1) general search on web, (2) more particularized search – series of lists you could pick from, (3) standardized reports, and (4) an approach that EPA uses where you can pull up a map and drop down to detail about a specific site.

*Q. How do you want data presentation organized (e.g., by site, waste type, program)?*

Waste data should be able to be displayed by facility.

Defense Program (DP) data should be displayed by program, subprogram, and facility.

Participants in Group 1 would like the data in the system to be the same data that are available at the sites. They do not think it is necessary to have all data presented consistently at the same level or in consistent formats. They pointed out that there is a danger in trying to fit or roll up the data to the determined level.

*Q. What do you want to be able to use the information for (e.g., track waste at a site, track waste transfers, compare year 1 to year 2)?*

Participants in Group 1 would like to use the information to track waste transfers. Waste transfer data needs to link to both the site where the waste is coming from and where it is going.

The system should have information on how much waste is going to commercial facilities and source term information (isotopes).

*Q. What formats would you like the output in (e.g., Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, comma-delimited, html table, PDF, charts, graphs)?*

Several members of the group indicated that spreadsheets are a good output format to display waste information. It would also be good to have charts and graphs on waste generated per year. For off-site shipments, the system should have a map with different sites and have links to where off-site shipments are going (include commercial waste). In addition, the system could use symbols that vary in size to indicate amounts of waste at sites (EPA does this for some power plant data it has) so the user can get an overview of the amount of waste.

Multiple output formats and automated calculations are of lowest priority behind other items discussed during this session.

#### *Other Issues*

- Several members of the group suggested that DOE may need to track data in national-level databases that are not specifically mentioned in the Settlement to ensure that the Stakeholders have access to all available data.
- The system has to overcome the problem of data transparency. Several members of the group believe that DOE has the data but is hiding it with the excuse that the data are not collected on the national level.
- The system needs more transparency regarding definitions of different wastes up front before the user is able to structure a query.
- The system needs to be displayed with both a text and a graphical options to accommodate the needs of different users.
- Data from the system should be available at DOE and public libraries and public institutions such as universities. In addition, there must be notice of when the data are available.
- The system should be accompanied by training and assistance, and help lines.

## 2. GROUP 1 SUMMARY POINTS FOR REPORTING TO THE PLENARY SESSION - LEAD BY JACKIE CABASSO

### Data

- Need to maintain data integrity
- Provide stream data by Program, Sub-Program, and facility
- Availability - what is "National" basis
- Would like to see other sources of data (i.e., Defense Programs)

### Waste Transfers - Commercial Disposal

- Need to track transportation of waste - need connectivity between shipping and receiving
- Need facilities data

### Definitions

- Search/query is the same thing
- Clarify definition of waste

### Presentation

- Desire low requirement text and higher requirement graphics
- Provide GIS/maps

### Access

- Make as broad as possible
- Provide data in reading rooms, public places (libraries, universities)
- Provide training

## 3. GROUP 2 DISCUSSION

*Q. Which of the three options (reports, searches, and queries) are you most interested in and will you use the most often?*

Participants in Group 2 explained that all three options are important. The system should start with queries, and then enable the user to drill down to more specific data. Data should be linked together. There should also be an index to facilitate specified searches. In addition, the system should track changes and search trends. Frequently requested searches should be built into the system as pre-defined search options.

*Q. How do you want data presentation organized (e.g., by site, waste type, program)?*

Participants in Group 2 would like data organized by waste type and by site. Waste should be displayed at the site level on a map (similar to the way the EPA allows watershed searches). The maps should show where the wastes are. Additional information about the waste should be obtainable through hyperlinks from the maps. This information should include what the waste is, what the potential hazards are, and historical information. Detailed data to see individual waste plumes, etc. should be available. This information should be easily understood by lay people and the system should be user-friendly. The system should include on-line definitions.

Questions about specific waste types or other site-related issues should be linked directly to the DOE site's web site.

For hazardous materials and other waste types, the system should include links to other federal information on the particular material (e.g., EPA's Envirofacts).

*Q. What do you want to be able to use the information for (e.g., track waste at a site, track waste transfers, compare year1 to year 2)?*

Participants in Group 2 would primarily want to use the data for comparative analyses. The stakeholders would like to use the information to determine the pedigree of the data. In addition, they would like to be able to give feedback on how the data are presented and the data quality. They would like a link to a web address for the person they should contact with this feedback.

Participants in Group 2 would also like a sufficient amount of explanation of the data. For example, Oak Ridge had a "Wizard" tutorial function to help walk the user through the information. There should also be alternatives to looking for data, such as a help line.

Participants in Group 2 had a concern about how waste is going to be categorized: by waste type, by hazard, by magnitude? The system should maintain reference tables to give users a "baseline" or something against which to make meaningful interpretations/comparisons of the data. In addition, the system should have links to other institutions that carry similar data (e.g., EPA, NTIS).

Participants in Group 2 asked how the database would address determinations of safety. Will the database contain the information necessary for the user to be able to determine how safe the site is? If the database cannot provide this information, it should have links to outside sources that can provide the information.

*Q. What formats would you like the output in (e.g., Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, comma-delimited, html table, PDF, charts, graphs)?*

PDF files need to be downloadable and users need the capability to copy and paste from the files. Wavelet images and fractal files may be better than PDFs. Need to have printable pages rather than pages that are only printable from a viewer.

#### *Other Issues*

- Accuracy of data is important. DOE sites should quantify the quality of their data, not simply say that it is poor quality, but explain in detail the quality of the data.
- The integrity of data/web links must be maintained.
- There are two customer segments: (1) those who interact with the database and (2) those who interact at the site level. DOE should track lessons learned from web sites within DOE. There should be a move toward data standardization across DOE

systems. Currently, the participants of the group noted that individual data systems show data discrepancies.

#### 4. GROUP 2 SUMMARY POINTS FOR REPORTING TO THE PLENARY SESSION - LEAD BY DIRK DUNNING

##### Integration

- Search, query, etc. need to work together
- Search engine software is key
- Access high-level and drill down to detail
- Need to be able to track trends - capture frequently requested information
- Link to litigants

##### Presentation

- GIS is a good start
- Provide graphical “map” of sites with comprehensive and detailed views
- Keep “human concern” in mind
- Track revisions
- Baseline data

##### Structure

- Link to other DOE data sites (not just homepages) and to external sites including other agencies
- Provide on-line definitions - “Wizard”
- Provide reference tables, etc.
- Limit re-load time
- Offer constant feedback capacity

##### Dilemmas

- Need standardization across DOE sites (format)
- Assess quality of raw data
- Keeping track of data revisions
- Provide user-friendly system - usable by lay people

#### 5. GROUP 3 DISCUSSION

- Several members of the group had a question about how hard-copies will be produced from the database and how they get generated. They also expressed concern about how to include non-electronic users in the database process. In addition, participants in Group 3 want access to downloadable and printable reports. It is important that they are able to print reports in their entirety and understand where the reports are getting the data.
- Participants in Group 3 are interested in having the system show how waste shipments will

occur, including the quantity of waste being shipped, how it is packaged, and the shipping routes.

- Several members of Group 3 asked whether the system will be accessible with Macintosh operating systems.
- The system should be accompanied by carefully explained and defined terms. It is important to make the system accessible to users with little or no technical background. The system should also include applicable regulatory standards, definitions of contaminant levels, and all information should be provided in context.
- The system should have an active glossary. On the home page, there should be links to acronyms, terms/definitions, units, unit conversion tables, contaminants and acceptable contaminant levels, technical help, and other sites where they can get additional information and technical training. There should also be links to state, county, city, and local information including the Department of Health. The system should include an on-line classroom.
- Several members of the group asked whether a user will have access to other analyses from Plaintiff groups and other groups outside DOE through the database.
- The web site and system manual/guidance should be written in language that is consistent with journalistic standards (not too technical), then it can change to a more detailed level with more technical discussion, but it should all be presented in simple language.
- Narrative discussion should accompany raw data to help put the numbers in context. In addition to putting numbers in context, sources of dangers should be named, marked, and explained.
- Raw data should be easily extracted from the system. The system should include hazardous incidents and site descriptions, and health/contamination factors to humans, wildlife, and the environment. There should be a link to related dose-reconstruction studies and demographics of communities.
- Several members of Group 3 commented that they will use the system for reports, searches, and queries. Search capabilities should be divided into levels of searching, including the ability to search all underlying databases that feed the Central Internet Database (IPABS-IS, FIMS, etc.) as well as the Central Internet Database.
- There should be a clear tie between sites sending and receiving waste. This information should also include the date when waste left a site and when it is received at the destination site and an explanation of why the waste is being shipped from point A to point B.
- IEER and NCI are both good examples of user-friendly web sites.

- Several members of the group thought that a map of the site is an easy way to access a lot of information. This way you can drill down to detailed information, the date the information was last updated, when the next assessment is planned, past uses of the site, future use of the site, off-site contamination, and historical information. Additional information should include dates of remediation actions taken or planned to be taken, and environmental monitoring data, status of cleanup initiatives that are underway, and whether there are decisions to be made. If a project is undergoing an EIS, this information should be provided. In addition, there should be a link to the Project Baseline Summaries and the associated budget information.
  - The system should flag information that is not reported and explain the reasoning behind the decision. If data are classified, there should be a note of when it is scheduled to be de-classified. Once it is de-classified, it should be placed into the Central Internet Database.
  - The database should include Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) information on a site and, if it is a Superfund site, what enforceable milestones are associated with it?
  - The system should include contact information including email addresses, phone numbers, and fax numbers for DOE, State, EPA officials, and people responsible for cleanup and waste management decisions at the site.
  - The system should display time lines including the frequency of data updating and indicators of progress.
  - Several members of the group asked how the system will track depleted uranium, MOX fuel, and other materials in transit between DOE and the commercial sector.
6. GROUP 3 SUMMARY POINTS FOR REPORTING TO THE PLENARY SESSION - LEAD BY ROBERT NEILL

#### User Interface

- Make system user-friendly
- Ensure timeliness of data - mechanism to update data
- Provide access to multiple levels of users/equipment
- Measure cleanup progress
- Glossary/conversion tables
- Recognize environmental justice impacts
- Link to underlying databases

#### Links

- To federal, state, and local working groups
- To contractors who do work for DOE
- To existing agreements



### Transportation

- Provide dates, times, quantities of waste transfer shipments
- Document inter-site connections

### Data

- Provide health impacts/risk by waste
- Identify who is the interpreter of these data
- Develop a mechanism for feedback on how information is being used - communication
- Compare data from sites/divisions to improve processes
- Provide contacts for up-to-date data sources

## 7. GROUP 4 DISCUSSION

*Q. Which of the three options (reports, searches, and queries) are you most interested in and will you use the most often?*

Participants in Group 4 commented that searches and queries are most important. They also mentioned that the system must have the ability to link to and search other sites.

*Q. How do you want data presentation organized (e.g., by site, waste type, program)?*

Participants in Group 4 recommended that the system should contain information on radioactivity and the definitions of different measures of radioactivity, and have links to health effects information. In addition, it should include information on half-lives of radionuclides for stewardship purposes. It would be helpful for the system to link to other explanatory material to add additional information for the user to access. There should be a glossary in a pull-down menu format so that it can be accessed without leaving the page. There should also be a table with standard conversions, and it should have a built-in converter to compare waste measures in different units. Several members of Group 4 would also like to be able to sort data.

Bill Wisenbaker of DOE suggested that much of this advanced functionality could be included in subsequent versions of the web application.

Several members of the group had a concern about leveling data and trying to force them into standard templates. They do not want to “dummy down” the data. They are particularly concerned with Environmental Restoration and Defense Programs data.

The system should be formatted so that the user has sort choices before a user submits a query. In addition, several members of Group 4 would like the system to allow easy access to raw data so users can manipulate data for their own purposes. This functionality includes the ability to sort data in real time.

Stephen Warren of DOE commented that the Office of Environmental Management (EM) has a system that collects site data so that it is consistent across the complex. This may conflict with the stakeholder need to be able to manipulate raw data.

Participants in Group 4 do not view the Central Internet Database as simply a database, but as a portal to the raw data and information.

*Q. What do you want to be able to use the information for (e.g., track waste at a site, track waste transfers, compare year1 to year 2)?*

Participants in Group 4 would primarily like to use the information to better understand waste transfers, future site conditions of DOE sites, and to identify inconsistencies in data, specifically between shipping and receiving sites. They would also like to use the data to analyze “policy” problems for waste management, to identify Defense Programs waste streams, and to identify waste streams from new weapons programs. Participants in Group 4 are primarily interested in understanding what is happening at a specific site, not across the complex. With this information they can compare what is happening at different sites. The system should have links to sites’ web sites to facilitate more access to local information. In addition, links should be bi-lateral, linking to web sites for stakeholder groups and to other organizations.

*Q. What types of information will you access most?*

Participants in Group 4 are primarily interested in waste information. They would like to access information about radioactivity of waste streams and volume and characteristics of waste as it changes over time. In addition, they would like to be able to track actual waste transfers against planned waste transfers and actual performance against planned performance. The system should be linked to the “Annual Environmental Surveillance Report” and to State information on cleanup agreement benchmarks.

The system should also track users and keep a log of user activity. The system should be able to track frequently used queries, so that these may be pulled out by the system administrator and developed into standard pre-prepared queries. The system should also have on-line “chat” capabilities.

*Q. What formats would you like the output in (e.g., Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, comma-delimited, html table, PDF, charts, graphs)?*

The system should have two or more levels of interface: a simple interface (for users with low requirement needs and computer knowledge) and an advanced interface. There should be a text and a graphical viewing option. The system must provide the flexibility to “slice and dice” data both within the system and as a download into a spreadsheet. Several members of Group 4 would like the output in Access, Excel, etc. They do not like the PDF format limitations.

*Q. What types of interactive calculations are you interested in (e.g., subtotals, variances, percent change)?*

Participants in Group 4 would like the system to provide all possible interactive calculations.

8. GROUP 4 SUMMARY POINTS FOR REPORTING TO THE PLENARY SESSION - LEAD BY KAREN FIREHOCK

- Include data on waste transfers
- Flag inconsistencies that indicate policy problems in management plans
- Include waste plumes in “new” weapons programs
- Have both easy and expert interfaces
- Include measures of radioactivity, not just cubic meters/metric tons
- Include half-lives of radioisotopes for long-term stewardship
- Provide detail of what’s happening at specific sites, facilities
- Enable comparisons with other sites through links

**Friday, June 4, 1999, 12:00 PM**  
**Next Steps**  
**Jim Werner, DOE**

Jim Werner of DOE gave a presentation outlining the next steps in developing and implementing the Central Internet Database. Mr. Werner's presentation included an overview of the next steps, the key project milestones that must be completed, and discussions of future stakeholder involvement in the process.

Following Mr. Werner's presentation, participants asked some final questions.

- Diane D'Arrigo, NIRS: *Asked for a clarification of whether or not tailings/mine wastes will be included in the Central Internet Database.*
  - Jim Werner of DOE explained that, yes, tailings/mine waste will be included (and that they are actually required by the Settlement Agreement under the name of "11(e)(2) byproducts").
  - Marilyn Tolbert-Smith of DOE explained that the Central Internet Database will include 11(e)(2) information from completed UMTRA (Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action) sites in addition to 11(e)(2) information that is collected by Grand Junction Office.
- Paige Leven, Heart of America NW: *Noted that there are ways to incorporate simple visual representations of the data in the Central Internet Database (e.g., maps) without sacrificing speed and simplicity.*
  - Ms. Leven's comment was noted.
- Dirk Dunning, State of Oregon, Office of Energy: *Reiterated Ms. Leven's comment and explained that not only is the image chosen (i.e., line drawing) an important factor in speed, etc., but so is the way the image is implemented (i.e., using compressed image technology).*
  - Mr. Dunning's comment was noted.
- *Several participants reiterated that there should be links to the Plaintiff group's web sites on the Central Internet Database web site.*
  - The participants comments were noted.
- Arjun Makhijani, IEER: *Made a comment that he did not want to have to wait for a long time for the web site to load (i.e., not use a lot of graphics, colors, etc. that will impact speed).*
  - Mr. Makhijani's comment was noted.

- Harry Rogers, Carolina Peace Resource Center: *Seconded Mr. Makhijani's comment about not wanting to wait a long period of time for the web site to load.*
  - Mr. Rogers' comment was noted.
- Bob Schaeffer, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability: *Interested in how DOE planned on having the Central Internet Database tested before it is implemented.*
  - Jim Werner of DOE responded that DOE is still looking into this and that there may be focus groups, a Beta application sent to select users, or some other strategy.

Following the last of the comments, Jim Werner of DOE explained that DOE will prepare a Stakeholder Forum Proceedings Document to be released for public comment by early July. Mr. Werner explained that stakeholders and DOE personnel will have 30 days to comment on the document. After the public comment period, a final Stakeholder Forum Proceedings Document will be released. In addition, Mr. Werner explained that all presentations from the forum can be found on the World Wide Web at <http://www.em.doe.gov/settlement/present.html>.

At the end of Mr. Werner's comments, he thanked participants for their hard work and ideas and closed the forum. In addition, some participants took the opportunity to thank DOE and the other participants.

# **Appendix A: DOE First National Stakeholder Forum List of Attendees**

<u>Last Name</u>	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Adams	Elaine	Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission
Adelman	David	Natural Resources Defense Council
Antkowiak	Marc	Hydrogeologic Incorporated
Baker	Kenneth	U.S. Department of Energy
Baker	Vicki	Lockheed-Martin Idaho Technologies
Ball	Lawrence	U.S. Department of Energy
Barker	Todd	Meridian Institute
Beard	Jeanne	U.S. Department of Energy
Beier	Ann	Western States Legal Foundation
Belisle	Mavis	The Peace Farm
Berry	Pat	U.S. Department of Energy
Breggin	Linda	Environmental Law Institute
Brooks	Vanessa	Center for Environmental Management Information
Broschious	Chuck	Environmental Defense Institute
Brower	Barbara	U.S. Department of Energy
Burns	Edward	Westinghouse Safety Management Solutions
Cabasso	Jacqueline	Western States Legal Foundation
Campbell	Bruce	Mason & Hanger Corporation
Cannon	James	U.S. Department of Energy
Cayce	James	U.S. Department of Energy
Chacey	Kenneth	U.S. Department of Energy
Chandler	Martin	TRW Systems & Information
Cheney	Craig	Project Performance Corporation
Clay	Jennifer	U.S. Department of Energy
Coghlan	Jay	Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety

<b><u>Last Name</u></b>	<b><u>First Name</u></b>	<b><u>Affiliation</u></b>
Cole	Pam	Project Performance Corporation
Costner	Brian	Institute for Energy and Environmental Research
Crandall	Kathy	Physicians for Social Responsibility
Crosland	Martha	U.S. Department of Energy
Curtis	Mary	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
D'Arrigo	Diane	Nuclear Information Research Service
deBruler	Gregory	Columbia River United
Doehnert	Mark	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Downing	Melinda	U.S. Department of Energy
Dunning	Dirk	State of Oregon, Office of Energy
Duran	Andrew	U.S. Department of Energy
Eckert	Howard	U.S. Department of Energy
Edelman	Arnold	U.S. Department of Energy
Edwards	Don	Meridian Institute
Emerson	Dwight	Analytical Services, Incorporated
Erdman	Jason	Project Performance Corporation
Ewankow	Maxine	Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council
Fairbourn	Paul	Lockheed-Martin Idaho Technologies
Firehock	Karen	Meridian Institute
Foster	Sharon	Center for Environmental Management Information
Frangione	Chris	Project Performance Corporation
Franke	John	DynCorp
Freund	George	Coalition 21
Garvey	Pat	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Gonzalez	Vanessa	State Energy Conservation Office



<b><u>Last Name</u></b>	<b><u>First Name</u></b>	<b><u>Affiliation</u></b>
Gordon	Susan	Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
Gordy	Mark	DynCorp (FI-20)
Greene	Amy	Project Performance Corporation
Gupta	Dinesh	U.S. Department of Energy
Haga	Constance	
Hanson	Christopher	Ross & Associates
Harris	Alicia	U.S. Department of Energy
Hays	Amy	Texas Agricultural Extension Service
Helm	Don	Morgan State University
Hoellen	Kris	Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste
Hopkins	Steve	Snake River Alliance
Horner	Amy	National Environmental Policy Institute
Houston	Christina	U.S. Department of Energy
Huffman	Mark	Science Applications International Corporation
Hurt	William	U.S. Department of Energy
Jaffe	Joe	Plenty International
Jorgensen	Russell	Sonoma County Center for Peace and Justice
Juarez	Teresa	New Mexico Alliance
Kelkenberg	Kelvin	U.S. Department of Energy
Kelley	Marylia	Tri-Valley CAREs
Kirshenberg	Seth	Energy Communities Alliance
Kosseff	Robin	Bay Area Nuclear Waste Coalition
Kramer	Evelyn	Center for Environmental Management Information
Kring	Bernice	Citizens Along the Roads & Tracks (C.A.R.T.)
Laumeier	Carol	Science Applications International Corporation

<b><u>Last Name</u></b>	<b><u>First Name</u></b>	<b><u>Affiliation</u></b>
Leven	Paige	Heart of America NW
Lyons	Carol	City of Arvada Rocky Flats
Maknijani	Arjun	Institute for Energy and Environmental Research
Marchetti	John	U.S. Department of Energy
Marshall	Tom	Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center
McBrien	Gregory	U.S. Department of Energy
McClain	Mildred	Citizens for Environmental Justice
Mealey	Tim	Meridian Institute
Monroe	Dean	U.S. Department of Energy
Morse	Brad	Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
Murphy	Ruth	Direct Outreach Impact Team
Neill	Robert	New Mexico EEG
Niece	Michael	Livemore Conversion Project
Ordaz	John	U.S. Department of Energy
Pachon	Carlos	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Perry	Eric	Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping
Picha	Kenneth	U.S. Department of Energy
Powers	Jane	U.S. Department of Energy
Pritikin	Trisha	Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
Rader	Jennifer	National Environmental Policy Institute
Ricks	Patricia	North Carolina Association of Black Mayors
Roderick	Jay	U.S. Department of Energy
Rogers	Harry	Carolina Peace Resource Center
Rohrer	Kevin	U.S. Department of Energy
Rupnik	John	Hydrogeologic Incorporated

<b><u>Last Name</u></b>	<b><u>First Name</u></b>	<b><u>Affiliation</u></b>
Schaeffer	Bob	Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
Shangraw	Rick	Project Performance Corporation
Shearer	Velma	Neighbors in Need
Sinshi	Tom	TetraTech
Slockish	Wilbur	Columbia River Education Economic Development
Smith	Gayle	DynCorp (FI-20)
Sullivan	Gregory	U.S. Department of Energy
Sweitzer	Mike	U.S. Department of Energy
Swenam	Lee	U.S. Department of Energy
Tiller	Robert	Physicians for Social Responsibility
Tolbert-Smith	Marilyn	U.S. Department of Energy
Tonkay	Doug	U.S. Department of Energy
van Berg	Jill	Environmental Law Institute
Veilvua	Michael	Western States Legal Foundation
Vought	Terry	U.S. Department of Energy
Wagner	Kay	Center for Environmental Management Information
Ward	Delroy	Science Applications International Corporation
Warner	Aurelia	Roswell Concerned Citizens
Warren	Stephen	U.S. Department of Energy
Webb	Mary	U.S. Department of Energy
Wood	Lawrence	Committee to Minimize Toxic Waste
Xia	Xiaojing	Texas A&M University
Yarrow	Ruth	Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility
Young	Ward	Bay Area Nuclear Waste Coalition
Zabarte	Ian	Western Shoshone National Council

<b><u>Last Name</u></b>	<b><u>First Name</u></b>	<b><u>Affiliation</u></b>
Zappe	Steve	New Mexico Environment Department
Zeitoun	Ibrahim	Science Applications International Corporation
Zenkowich	Mathew	U.S. Department of Energy